



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/720,871	11/24/2003	Roger S. Kerr	82473BNAB	5124
7590	08/25/2005		EXAMINER	
Eastman Kodak Company Patent Legal Staff 343 State Street Rochester, NY 14650-2201			HAWKINS, CHERYL N	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1734	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Gm  
h  
✓

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/720,871	KERR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Cheryl N. Hawkins	1734

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-8,10-13,15-20 and 22-24 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-8,10-13,15-20 and 22-24 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 November 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
     1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
     2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
     3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.   |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                                   |

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440). As to Claim 1, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising creating a coated sheet of plastic material; laminating a pre-laminate sheet of material consisting of a first thermoplastic layer and a first support layer to the coated sheet of plastic material; removing the first support layer forming a pre-laminated receiver stock; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a second support layer; laminating the imaged receiver sheet with a pre-laminated receiver stock; and removing the second support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 31-58; column 6, lines 41-43 and 60-63; column 7, lines 7-9 and 13-19 and 28-32; column 3, lines 3-4).

As to Claims 10 and 22, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the image is an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2).

As to Claim 13, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating sheet of plastic material; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer; laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet; and removing the support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 2-20).

3. Claims 13, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Brault et al. (US 5,837,375). As to Claim 13, Brault et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating a sheet of plastic material (Figures 2, 3a, and 3b; substrate 22; column 8, lines 41-46); creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer (Figures 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, ink receptive layer 16, ink imaged layer 18, temporary carrier layer 12; column 4, lines 17-22); laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet (column 8, lines 62-67); and removing the support layer (Figure 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, temporary carrier layer 12; column 9, lines 49-51) forming a pre-press proof.

As to Claim 15, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the support layer is comprised of a support base and a release layer (column 5, lines 6-17).

As to Claim 22, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the image (Figure 1, ink imaged layer 18) is an inkjet generated image (Figure 1, inkjet device 11)

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 2, 3, 10, 13, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440) in view of Sasaki (US 4,786,537).

As to Claim 1, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising creating a coated sheet of plastic material; laminating a pre-laminate sheet of

material consisting of a first thermoplastic layer and a first support layer to the coated sheet of plastic material; removing the first support layer forming a pre-laminated receiver stock; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a second support layer; laminating the imaged receiver sheet with a pre-laminated receiver stock; and removing the second support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 31-58; column 6, lines 41-43 and 60-63; column 7, lines 7-9 and 13-19 and 28-32; column 3, lines 3-4).

As to Claims 2, 3, and 15, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the removable first and second support layers are coated paper substrates (column 3, lines 25-26), but Nordeen et al. is silent as method wherein the first and second support layers are comprised of a support base and a release layer. It is well known and conventional in the transfer art, as disclosed by Sasaki (column 2, lines 60-63), to provide a support layer which is comprised of a support base and a release layer, i.e. a paper support base having a silicone release layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the coated paper disclosed by Nordeen et al. with a structure comprised of a support base, i.e. a paper substrate, and a release layer, i.e. a silicone layer, as suggested by Sasaki; the fabrication of a removable support layer having a support base and a release layer being well established in the art.

As to Claims 10 and 22, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the image is an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2).

As to Claim 13, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating sheet of plastic material; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer; laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet; and removing the support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 2-20).

6. Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 16, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440) in view of Sasaki (US 4,786,537) and Kolobow (US 4,093,515).

As to Claim 1, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising creating a coated sheet of plastic material; laminating a pre-laminate sheet of material consisting of a first thermoplastic layer and a first support layer to the coated sheet of plastic material; removing the first support layer forming a pre-laminated receiver stock; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a second support layer; laminating the imaged receiver sheet with a pre-laminated receiver stock; and removing the second support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 31-58; column 6, lines 41-43 and 60-63; column 7, lines 7-9 and 13-19 and 28-32; column 3, lines 3-4).

As to Claims 4 and 16, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the removable second support layer is a coated paper substrate (column 3, lines 25-26), but Nordeen et al. is silent as method wherein the second support layer is comprised of a support base and a release layer. It is well known and conventional in the transfer art, as disclosed by Sasaki (column 2, lines 60-63), to provide a support layer which is comprised of a support base and a release layer, i.e. a paper support base having a silicone release layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the coated paper disclosed by Nordeen et al. with a structure comprised of a support base, i.e. a paper substrate, and a release layer, i.e. a silicone layer, as suggested by Sasaki; the fabrication of a removable support layer having a support base and a release layer being well established in the art.

As to Claims 4 and 16, the references as combined do not disclose a method wherein the second support layer includes an aluminized layer. It is well known and conventional in the laminating art, as disclosed by Kolobow (column 5, lines 27-34), to provide a removable support layer with an aluminized layer to promote the releasability of the support layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the second support layer of the references as combined to include an aluminized layer as suggested by Kolobow to promote the releasability of the support layer.

As to Claims 10 and 22, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the image is an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2).

As to Claim 13, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating sheet of plastic material; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer; laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet; and removing the support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 2-20).

7. Claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 13, 17, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440) in view of Pilu (US 6,460,993).

As to Claim 1, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising creating a coated sheet of plastic material; laminating a pre-laminate sheet of material consisting of a first thermoplastic layer and a first support layer to the coated sheet of plastic material; removing the first support layer forming a pre-laminated receiver stock; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a second support layer; laminating the imaged receiver sheet with a pre-laminated receiver stock; and removing the second support layer forming a pre-press proof

(column 10, lines 31-58; column 6, lines 41-43 and 60-63; column 7, lines 7-9 and 13-19 and 28-32; column 3, lines 3-4).

As to Claims 5, 6, 17, and 18, Nordeen et al. discloses a pre-press proof formed by the method recited in Claim 1, but does not disclose a pre-press proof with a resolution of between 1000 dpi and 4000 dpi or a resolution of between 1800 dpi and 3000 dpi. Pilu discloses that it is not uncommon for individual users to possess ink jet printers having a resolution of perhaps up to 2400 dpi and that high resolution printing results in printed items which are more convincing (column 3, lines 44-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the pre-press proof of Nordeen et al. with a resolution of between 1800 dpi and 3000 dpi, i.e. 2400 dpi, as suggested by Pilu to yield an convincing image with excellent clarity.

As to Claims 10 and 22, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the image is an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2).

As to Claim 13, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating sheet of plastic material; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer; laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet; and removing the support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 2-20).

8. Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 19, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440) in view of Yamaguchi (US 6,435,640).

As to Claim 1, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising creating a coated sheet of plastic material; laminating a pre-laminate sheet of

material consisting of a first thermoplastic layer and a first support layer to the coated sheet of plastic material; removing the first support layer forming a pre-laminated receiver stock; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a second support layer; laminating the imaged receiver sheet with a pre-laminated receiver stock; and removing the second support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 31-58; column 6, lines 41-43 and 60-63; column 7, lines 7-9 and 13-19 and 28-32; column 3, lines 3-4).

As to Claims 7, 8, 19, and 20, Nordeen et al. discloses providing the imaged receiver sheet with an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2), but Nordeen et al. is silent as to the imaged receiver sheet comprising either a monochrome or a multi-colored image. It is well known and conventional in the printing art, as disclosed by Yamaguchi (column 3, lines 40-42), to provide ink jet printed images in either monochrome or multicolor to create customized images. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the inkjet generated image of Nordeen et al. as either a monochrome or multi-colored image as suggested by Yamaguchi; the utilization of inkjet printing to provide both monochrome and multi-colored images being well established in the art.

As to Claims 10 and 22, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the image is an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2).

As to Claim 13, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating sheet of plastic material; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer; laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet; and removing the support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 2-20).

9. Claims 1, 10, 11, 13, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440) in view Shimizu et al. (US 5,489,355)

As to Claim 1, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising creating a coated sheet of plastic material; laminating a pre-laminate sheet of material consisting of a first thermoplastic layer and a first support layer to the coated sheet of plastic material; removing the first support layer forming a pre-laminated receiver stock; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a second support layer; laminating the imaged receiver sheet with a pre-laminated receiver stock; and removing the second support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 31-58; column 6, lines 41-43 and 60-63; column 7, lines 7-9 and 13-19 and 28-32; column 3, lines 3-4).

As to Claims 10 and 22, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the image is an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2).

As to Claims 11 and 23, Nordeen et al. does not disclose a method wherein the adhesive coating of the plastic material takes place in a printing press. It is well known in the adhesive bonding art, as disclosed by Shimizu et al. (column 3, lines 35-38), to provide a substrate with an adhesive coating in a printing press. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the adhesive coating of the plastic material of Nordeen et al. in a printing press as suggested by Shimizu et al.; the utilization of a printing press to provide a substrate with an adhesive coating being well established in the art.

As to Claim 13, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating sheet of plastic material; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support

layer; laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet; and removing the support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 2-20).

10. Claims 1, 10, 12, 13, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440) in view of Kondos et al. (US 6,593,423).

As to Claim 1, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising creating a coated sheet of plastic material; laminating a pre-laminate sheet of material consisting of a first thermoplastic layer and a first support layer to the coated sheet of plastic material; removing the first support layer forming a pre-laminated receiver stock; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a second support layer; laminating the imaged receiver sheet with a pre-laminated receiver stock; and removing the second support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 31-58; column 6, lines 41-43 and 60-63; column 7, lines 7-9 and 13-19 and 28-32; column 3, lines 3-4).

As to Claims 10 and 22, Nordeen et al. discloses a method wherein the image is an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2).

As to Claims 12 and 24, Nordeen et al. does not disclose a method wherein the sheet of plastic material is coated with chlorinated polypropylene. It is well known and conventional in the adhesive bonding art, as disclosed by Kondos et al. (column 1, lines 35-39; column 2, lines 39-50), to coat the bonding surface of a polymeric sheet with an adhesion promoting agent, e.g. chlorinated polypropylene, to increase the adherence of the plastic sheet to other substrates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Nordeen et al. to include coating the sheet of plastic material with an adhesion

promoting agent, i.e. chlorinated polypropylene, as suggested by Kondos et al. to increase the adherence of the plastic sheet to the other sheet material thereby resulting in a securely bonded laminate.

As to Claim 13, Nordeen et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating sheet of plastic material; creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer; laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet; and removing the support layer forming a pre-press proof (column 10, lines 2-20).

11. Claims 13, 15, 16, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brault et al. (US 5,837,375) in view of Kolobow (US 4,093,515).

As to Claim 13, Brault et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating a sheet of plastic material (Figures 2, 3a, and 3b; substrate 22; column 8, lines 41-46); creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer (Figures 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, ink receptive layer 16, ink imaged layer 18, temporary carrier layer 12; column 4, lines 17-22); laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet (column 8, lines 62-67); and removing the support layer (Figure 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, temporary carrier layer 12; column 9, lines 49-51) forming a pre-press proof.

As to Claim 15, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the support layer is comprised of a support base and a release layer (column 5, lines 6-17).

As to Claim 16, Brault et al. does not disclose a method wherein the support layer includes an aluminized layer. It is well known and conventional in the laminating art, as disclosed by Kolobow (column 5, lines 27-34), to provide a removable support layer with an

aluminized layer to promote the releasability of the support layer. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the second support layer of Brault et al. to include an aluminized layer as suggested by Kolobow to promote the releasability of the support layer.

As to Claim 22, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the image (Figure 1, ink imaged layer 18) is an inkjet generated image (Figure 1, inkjet device 11)

12. Claims 13, 15, 17, 18, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brault et al. (US 5,837,375) in view of Pilu (US 6,460,993).

As to Claim 13, Brault et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating a sheet of plastic material (Figures 2, 3a, and 3b; substrate 22; column 8, lines 41-46); creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer (Figures 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, ink receptive layer 16, ink imaged layer 18, temporary carrier layer 12; column 4, lines 17-22); laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet (column 8, lines 62-67); and removing the support layer (Figure 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, temporary carrier layer 12; column 9, lines 49-51) forming a pre-press proof.

As to Claim 15, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the support layer is comprised of a support base and a release layer (column 5, lines 6-17).

As to Claims 17 and 18, Brault et al. discloses a pre-press proof formed by the method recited in Claim 13, but does not disclose a pre-press proof with a resolution of between 1000 dpi and 4000 dpi or a resolution of between 1800 dpi and 3000 dpi. Pilu discloses that it is not uncommon for individual users to possess ink jet printers having a resolution of perhaps up to

2400 dpi and that the higher the resolution the printer the more convincing the printed item will be (column 3, lines 44-51). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the pre-press proof of Brault et al. with a resolution of between 1800 dpi and 3000 dpi, i.e. 2400 dpi, as suggested by Pilu to yield an convincing image with excellent clarity.

As to Claim 22, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the image (Figure 1, ink imaged layer 18) is an inkjet generated image (Figure 1, inkjet device 11)

13. Claims 13, 15, 19, 20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brault et al. (US 5,837,375) in view of Yamaguchi (US 6,435,640).

As to Claim 13, Brault et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating a sheet of plastic material (Figures 2, 3a, and 3b; substrate 22; column 8, lines 41-46); creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer (Figures 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, ink receptive layer 16, ink imaged layer 18, temporary carrier layer 12; column 4, lines 17-22); laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet (column 8, lines 62-67); and removing the support layer (Figure 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, temporary carrier layer 12; column 9, lines 49-51) forming a pre-press proof.

As to Claim 15, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the support layer is comprised of a support base and a release layer (column 5, lines 6-17).

As to Claims 19 and 20, Brault et al. discloses providing the imaged receiver sheet with an inkjet generated image (column 3, lines 1-2), but Brault et al. is silent as to the imaged receiver sheet comprising either a monochrome or a multi-colored image. It is well known and

conventional in the printing art, as disclosed by Yamaguchi (column 3, lines 40-42), to provide ink jet printed images in either monochrome or multicolor to create customized images. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the inkjet generated image of Brault et al. as either a monochrome or multi-colored image as suggested by Yamaguchi; the utilization of inkjet printing to provide both monochrome and multi-colored images being well established in the art.

As to Claim 22, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the image (Figure 1, ink imaged layer 18) is an inkjet generated image (Figure 1, inkjet device 11)

14. Claims 13, 15, 22, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brault et al. (US 5,837,375) in view of Shimizu et al. (US 5,489,355).

As to Claim 13, Brault et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating a sheet of plastic material (Figures 2, 3a, and 3b; substrate 22; column 8, lines 41-46); creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer (Figures 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, ink receptive layer 16, ink imaged layer 18, temporary carrier layer 12; column 4, lines 17-22); laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet (column 8, lines 62-67); and removing the support layer (Figure 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, temporary carrier layer 12; column 9, lines 49-51) forming a pre-press proof.

As to Claim 15, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the support layer is comprised of a support base and a release layer (column 5, lines 6-17).

As to Claim 22, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the image (Figure 1, ink imaged layer 18) is an inkjet generated image (Figure 1, inkjet device 11)

As to Claim 23, Brault et al. does not disclose a method wherein the adhesive coating of the plastic material takes place in a printing press. It is well known in the adhesive bonding art, as disclosed by Shimizu et al. (column 3, lines 35-38), to provide a substrate with an adhesive coating in a printing press. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the adhesive coating of the plastic material of Brault et al. in a printing press as suggested by Shimizu; the utilization of a printing press to provide a substrate with an adhesive coating being well established in the art.

15. Claims 13, 15, 22, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brault et al. (US 5,837,375) in view of Kondos et al. (US 6,593,423).

As to Claim 13, Brault et al. discloses a method for laminating a pre-press proof comprising coating a sheet of plastic material (Figures 2, 3a, and 3b; substrate 22; column 8, lines 41-46); creating an imaged receiver sheet with a support layer (Figures 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, ink receptive layer 16, ink imaged layer 18, temporary carrier layer 12; column 4, lines 17-22); laminating the coated sheet of plastic material to the imaged receiver sheet (column 8, lines 62-67); and removing the support layer (Figure 1, 2, 3a, and 3b, temporary carrier layer 12; column 9, lines 49-51) forming a pre-press proof.

As to Claim 15, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the support layer is comprised of a support base and a release layer (column 5, lines 6-17).

As to Claim 22, Brault et al. discloses a method wherein the image (Figure 1, ink imaged layer 18) is an inkjet generated image (Figure 1, inkjet device 11)

As to Claim 24, Brault et al. does not disclose a method wherein the sheet of plastic material is coated with chlorinated polypropylene. It is well known and conventional in the adhesive bonding art, as disclosed by Kondos et al. (column 1, lines 35-39; column 2, lines 39-50), to coat the bonding surface of a polymeric sheet with an adhesion promoting agent, e.g. chlorinated polypropylene, to increase the adherence of the plastic sheet to other substrates. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method of Brault et al. to include coating the sheet of plastic material with an adhesion promoting agent, i.e. chlorinated polypropylene, as suggested by Kondos et al. to increase the adherence of the plastic sheet to the other sheet material thereby resulting in a securely bonded laminate.

*Response to Arguments*

16. In response to the applicant's cancellation of Claims 9, 14 and 21 and the amendment of Claims 15 and 16, the rejections of those claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, have been withdrawn.

In response to the applicant's arguments that the reference of Kerr (US 6,508,5278) does not qualify as prior art, the examiner agrees and notes that the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection have been made in view of the newly discovered references of Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440) and Brault et al. (US 5,837,375). Claims 1, 10, 13, and 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Nordeen et al. (US 6,022,440). Claims 1-8, 10-13, 15-20, and 22-24 has been rejected under 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nordeen et al. in view of various secondary references.

Claims 13, 15, and 22 have been rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Brault et al. (US 5,837,375). Claims 13, 15-20, and 22-24 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Brault et al. in view of various secondary references.

***Conclusion***

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl N. Hawkins whose telephone number is (571) 272-1229. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher A. Fiorilla can be reached on (517) 272-1187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

*Cheryl N. Hawkins*  
Cheryl N. Hawkins  
August 19, 2005

*CF*  
CHRIS FIORILLA  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
AU 1734